

PROTOCOL OF THE COMPETITION JURY EVALUATION MEETING

(the "Protocol")

CONTRACTING AUTHORITY:	Správa železnic, státní organizace Dlážděná 1103/7 110 00 Prague 1
NAME OF THE COMPETITION:	Správa železnic Headquarters

The competition was announced in accordance with Act No. 134/2016 Sb., the Public Procurement Act, as amended (the "PPA"); Act No. 183/2006 Sb., on Spatial Planning and Building Regulations (the Building Act), as amended; Act No. 360/1992 Sb., on the Exercise of the Profession of Authorised Architects and on the Exercise of the Profession of Authorised Engineers and Technicians Active in Construction, as amended; the Competition Rules of the Czech Chamber of Architects of 24 April 1993, as amended (the "CCA Competition Rules"); and taking into account the provisions of Sections 1772 to 1779 of Act No. 89/2012 Sb., the Civil Code, as amended.

On 16–18 March 2021, an online evaluation meeting of the jury of the architectural competition for design, entitled "**Správa železnic Headquarters**" (the "**Competition**") took place, the Contracting Authority of which is Správa železnic, státní organizace (the "**Contracting Authority**").

A protocol (the "**Protocol**") was prepared from the jury evaluation meeting, which summarises the course of the jury evaluation meeting. These Minutes will form an integral part of the report on the course of the Competition.

Based on the consent of the chairman of the jury, Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík, the evaluation meeting of the jury was organisationally led by the representative of the Competition organiser, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková, in the constant presence and under the supervision of the chairman of the jury.

DAY ONE – 16 March 2021

1. The following members of the jury attended the evaluation meeting on 16 March 2021:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
REGULAR MEMBERS	REGULAR MEMBERS
1. Bc. Jiří Svoboda, MBA – present from 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer
3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
ALTERNATES:	ALTERNATES:
1. Ing. Petr Hofhanzl (Správa železnic)	1. Ing. arch. Jan Kasl
2. Ing. Jakub Bazgier (Správa železnic)	2. Pavla Pannová
3. Ing. Pavla Urbánková (Správa železnic)	
4. Ing. Petr Vaníček (Správa železnic)	
5. Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý	
6. JUDr. Tomáš Homola	

2. The following individuals also took part in the jury's evaluation meeting on 16 March 2021:

Representative of the Competition organiser:	Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková
Competition Secretary:	Ing. arch. Miroslav Vodák
Competition Entries Reviewer:	Ing. arch. Tomáš Zdvihal

Invited Expert:	Ing. Martin Hvězda
Invited Expert:	Ing. Lukáš Tittl

3. All the individuals present at the evaluation meeting of the jury confirmed their participation by signing a declaration, which forms **Annex No. 1 to this Protocol**.

09:30 a.m. – 09:35: a.m. INTRODUCTION

4. On 16 March 2021 at 9:30 a.m., the evaluation meeting of the Competition jury was started by the representative of the Competition organiser, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková.
5. At the beginning, individual members of the jury, representatives of the subsidiary bodies of the Competition jury and invited experts were welcomed.
6. Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková acquainted those present with the course of the Competition during the competition period. She acquainted those present with the course of opening of the competition entries (in both paper and electronic form) on the basis of the protocol on the opening of envelopes and on the course of the assessment of compliance with the participation conditions of individual participants of the Competition based on the report on the assessment of compliance with the participation conditions, evidencing that all participants of the Competition have proven compliance with the conditions for participation in the Competition.
7. Furthermore, Mgr. Kulhánková summarised that due to the fact that the evaluation meeting of the jury takes place online, the subject of the assessment and evaluation are the competition entries submitted by the participants in electronic form (see the explanation of the Competition Terms and Conditions, set no. 5). With respect to this, Mgr. Kulhánková stated in the protocol that all the jurors had received the competition entries (with checked anonymity) in electronic form well in advance of the evaluation meeting, both the graphic and textual part.
8. The jurors confirmed they had read up the competition entries in electronic form and thus had individually studied the competition entries before the evaluation meeting.

09:45 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.: REVIEW OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES

9. The reviewer of the competition entries acquainted the present jurors with the reviewer's report, which forms **Annex No. 2 to this Protocol**, and drew attention to any findings identified in relation to the individual competition entries. The extent of the review of individual competition entries is set out in **Annex No. 2 to this Protocol**.
10. After acquainting the jury with the reviewer's report, the jury subsequently voted on each competition entry, in relation to which any finding was stated in the reviewer's report.
11. Voting jurors:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Ing. Petr Hofhanzl (Správa železnic)	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer

3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

12. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: Each voting member shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury decides by a majority of votes; unless another voting procedure is specified in the protocol. The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

IN FAVOUR: 7
 AGAINST: 0
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

09:48 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.: VOTING OF THE JURY (TO THE REVIEW OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES)

13. **09:48 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 1**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 1, the reviewer identified the following finding:

Competition Entry No. 1	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain a view from the platform of the Smíchov station. It was recommended that this view be a part of panel 5–6 of the graphic part of the competition entry.
--------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 1 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the fact identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"

IN FAVOUR: 7
 AGAINST: 0
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 1 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

14. **09:52 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 2.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 2, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 2	The graphic part of the competition entry contains floor plans, sections and views at a scale of 1:650. It was recommended that the scale of floor plans, sections and views be 1:600.
--------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scales of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 2 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 2 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

15. **09:55 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 6.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 6, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 6	The situation on panel 1 of the graphic part of the competition entry is not displayed in the recommended scale of 1:600.
--------------------------------	---

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the situation on panel 1 of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 6 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 6 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

16. **10:00 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 8.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 8, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 8	The graphic part of the competition entry contains horizontal views and sections at a scale of 1:700. It was recommended that the scale of views and sections be 1:600.
--------------------------------	---

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the views and sections of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 8 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 8 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

17. **10:02 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 14.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 14, the reviewer identified the following finding:

Competition Entry No. 14	The graphic part of the competition entry contains floor plans, sections and views at a scale of 1:650. It was recommended that the scale of floor plans, sections and views be 1:600.
	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain a view from Nádražní street, from north-east. It was recommended that this view be a part of panel 5–6 of the graphic part of the competition entry.

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 1: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the floor plans, views and sections of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be

complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 2: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 14 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 14 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

18. **10:04 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 15.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 15, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 15	The graphic part of the competition entry contains floor plans, sections and views at a scale of 1:500. It was recommended that the scale of floor plans, sections and views be 1:600.
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the floor plans, views and sections of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 15 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 15 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

19. **10:05 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 16.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 16, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 16	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain a detail of the facade cladding in section and floor plan. It was recommended that the detail of the facade cladding be a part of panel 2 of the graphic part of the competition entry.
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the visualisation of the detail of the facade cladding in the section and floor plan on panel 2 of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 16 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 16 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

20. **10:06 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 17.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 17, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 17	The graphic part of the competition entry contains floor plans, sections and views at a scale of 1:500. It was recommended that the scale of floor plans, sections and views be 1:600.
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the floor plans, views and sections of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with.

The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 17 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 17 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

21. **10:07 a.m.** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 18.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 18, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 18	Keys and descriptions of the graphic part submitted only in English without translation into Czech
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: The Competition Terms and Conditions required that the graphic part of the competition entry be submitted in Czech, or in English with translation of descriptive parts into Czech. The participant deviated from the given requirement by submitting keys and descriptions only in English. However, the competition entry of the participant as a whole is submitted in English with translation into Czech. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, this is a formal deviation, which does not reduce the comprehensibility of the competition entry, does not violate anonymity and does not favour the competition entry over other competition entries. For the sake of legal certainty, I recommend the jury to proceed similarly according to Section 10 (6) a) of the Competition Rules (same as in the case of voting on formal deviations from the binding Competition Terms and Conditions), i.e. the participant shall be kept in the Competition if the jury decides so by a four-fifths majority of its regular members.

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 18 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 18 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

22. **10:08 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 19.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 19, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 19	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain a drawing of broader relations at a scale of 1:10000. It was recommended that the competition entry includes such a drawing on panel 1.
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 19 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 19 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

23. **10:10 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 20.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 20, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 20	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain a completed table of areas. It was recommended that the competition entry includes this table on panel 2.
	The detail of the facade cladding on panel 2 is displayed at a scale of 1:100. A scale of 1:20 was recommended.
	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain a view from Nádražní street, from north-east. It was recommended that this view be a part of panel 5–6 of the graphic part of the competition entry.

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 1: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In addition, the participant submitted a table of areas separately as an Excel file, which was a part of the participant's competition entry.

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 2: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the detail of the facade cladding. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition

Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 3: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 20 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 6

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 20 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

24. **10:14 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 22.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 22, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 22	The graphic part of the competition entry contains floor plans, sections and views at a scale of 1:750 and 1:400. It was recommended that the scale of floor plans, sections and views be 1:600.
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the floor plans, views and sections of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 22 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 22 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

25. **10:18 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 23.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 23, the reviewer identified the following finding:

Competition Entry No. 23	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain floor plans of the 4th–6th above-ground floors. It was recommended to display floor plans of the above-ground floors in the recommended scale of 1:600 on panel 3.
---------------------------------	---

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. In addition, the Contracting Authority's recommendation for the content of panel no. 3 was not specified so that the participant should display the floor plans of all above-ground floors. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 23 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 23 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

26. **10:21 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 24.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 24, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 24	The graphic part of the competition entry contains floor plans of the underground floors at a scale of 1:750. It was recommended that the scale of floor plans be 1:600.
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the floor plans of

the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 24 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 24 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

27. **10:22 a.m.** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 25.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 25, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 25	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain the situation at a scale of 1:600. It was recommended to display this situation on panel 1.
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 25 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 25 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

28. **10:23 a.m.** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 26.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 26, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 26	The graphic part of the competition entry is mostly submitted only in English without translation of the descriptive parts into Czech.
	Sections and view displayed in axonometric view; drawings are not at a scale of 1:600. In the axonometric view, the scales cannot be accurately verified due to the rotation of the axes. The participant states a scale of 1:600.
	In the textual part of the competition entry, one of the paragraphs is submitted only in English without translation into Czech.

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 1: The Competition Terms and Conditions required that the graphic part of the competition entry be submitted in Czech, or in English with translation of descriptive parts into Czech. The participant deviated from the given requirement by submitting the descriptive parts of the graphic part mostly only in English. However, the competition entry of the participant as a whole is submitted in English with translation into Czech. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, this is a formal deviation, which does not reduce the comprehensibility of the competition entry, does not violate anonymity and does not favour the competition entry over other competition entries. For the sake of legal certainty, I recommend the jury to proceed similarly according to Section 10 (6) a) of the Competition Rules (same as in the case of voting on formal deviations from the binding Competition Terms and Conditions), i.e. the participant shall be kept in the Competition if the jury decides so by a four-fifths majority of its regular members.

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 2: Although the sections and views are displayed in an axonometric view, where it is not possible to precisely determine the scales due to the rotation of the axes, the Contracting Authority's requirement for the scale of views and sections of the graphic part of the competition entry was only recommended. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 3: Same as for finding no. 1 in relation to the textual part.

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 26 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 26 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 1 and 3: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 2: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the sections of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 28 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 28 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

31. **10:34 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 29.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 29, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 29	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain a drawing of broader relations at a scale of 1:2500. It was recommended that the competition entry includes such a drawing on panel 1.
	The graphic part of the competition entry contains a cross-section at a scale of 1:300. It was recommended that the scale of sections be 1:600.

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 1: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the

Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 2: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scale of the section of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 29 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 29 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

32. **10:37 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 31.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 31, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 31	Drawing of broader relations displayed at a scale of 1:20000. It was recommended that the competition entry includes such a drawing at a scale of 1:10000 and 1:2500 on panel 1.
	The graphic part of the competition entry contains a detail of the facade cladding at a scale of 1:10. It was recommended that the scale be 1:20.
	Floor plans of the underground floors displayed at a scale of 1:1200, sections displayed at a scale of 1:300. It was recommended that the scale be 1:600.
	The spatial visualisation of the interior showing the entrance foyer is missing. It was recommended that the competition entry includes a spatial visualisation of interiors (entrance foyer, large HUB) on panel 5-6.

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 1-3: It was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the scales of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended scale of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. Before the deadline for the submission of the competition entries, the Contracting Authority was repeatedly asked whether the scales in

the graphic part of the competition entries must be complied with. The Contracting Authority always explained that the scales set are only recommendations. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser on finding no. 4: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 31 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 31 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

33. **10:37 a.m.** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 34.**

During the review of Competition Entry No. 34, the reviewer identified the following findings:

Competition Entry No. 34	The graphic part of the competition entry does not contain a drawing of broader relations at a scale of 1:10000. It was recommended that the competition entry includes such a drawing on panel 1.
---------------------------------	--

Statement of the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser: This was only a recommending requirement of the Contracting Authority for the content of the graphic part of the competition entry. The deviation of the participant from the recommended content of the graphic part of the competition entries is not a violation of the Competition Terms and Conditions. In the opinion of the representative of the Competition organiser, it is only a deviation from the recommendation of the Contracting Authority, and there is no reason to exclude the competition entry from participation in the Competition due to this deviation (with regard to the entry being otherwise comprehensible, without favouring the competition entry concerned over other competition entries).

Statement of the reviewer: I agree.

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 34 being kept in the Competition and advancing to the stage of competition entries evaluation, despite the facts identified by the reviewer in the competition entries review report?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 34 is kept in the Competition and advances to the stage of competition entries evaluation.**

34. Following the voting result, a list of competition entries which advance to the evaluation phase was subsequently summarised, namely:

Competition Entry No. 1
Competition Entry No. 2
Competition Entry No. 3
Competition Entry No. 4
Competition Entry No. 5
Competition Entry No. 6
Competition Entry No. 7
Competition Entry No. 8
Competition Entry No. 9
Competition Entry No. 10
Competition Entry No. 11
Competition Entry No. 12
Competition Entry No. 13
Competition Entry No. 14
Competition Entry No. 15
Competition Entry No. 16
Competition Entry No. 17
Competition Entry No. 18
Competition Entry No. 19
Competition Entry No. 20

Competition Entry No. 21
Competition Entry No. 22
Competition Entry No. 23
Competition Entry No. 24
Competition Entry No. 25
Competition Entry No. 26
Competition Entry No. 27
Competition Entry No. 28
Competition Entry No. 29
Competition Entry No. 30
Competition Entry No. 31
Competition Entry No. 32
Competition Entry No. 33
Competition Entry No. 34

35. After the voting, Mgr. Kulhánková asked if any of the members of the jury had any proposal for revocation. No proposal for revocation was made.
36. The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

10:50 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. BREAK

11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. PRESENTATION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES

37. From 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., the General Director of Správa železnic, Bc. Jiří Svoboda, joined the meeting of the jury.
38. Due to the fact that the electronic version of the competition entries was provided to the jury for individual assessment well in advance of the evaluation meeting, the evaluation meeting did not include individual studying of the competition entries. The individual studying of the competition entries was carried out by the jurors independently, on the basis of the provided competition entries in electronic form before the evaluation meeting.
39. In the period from 11:30 a.m. to 6:10 p.m. (with the below breaks), the competition entries were presented to the jury. The presentation of the competition entries to the jury

(based on the graphic part and the text report submitted by the participant) was realised, after a previous agreement with Mgr. Kulhánková, by the members of the independent part of the jury listed below:

Presentation of Competition Entry No. 1–6:	Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
Presentation of Competition Entry No. 7–10:	Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer
Presentation of Competition Entry No. 11–14:	Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
Presentation of Competition Entry No. 15–18:	David Hlouch
Presentation of Competition Entry No. 19–22:	Pavla Pannová
Presentation of Competition Entry No. 23–26:	Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig
Presentation of Competition Entry No. 27–30:	Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý
Presentation of Competition Entry No. 31–34:	Ing. arch. Jan Kasl

40. As part of the presentation of individual competition entries, the jury discussion was held on individual competition entries and the opinions of the invited experts of the Competition were presented, namely Ing. Martin Hvězda, Ing. Lukáš Tittl and Mgr. Jiří Skalický (represented by Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý).

1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. BREAK

1:30 p.m. – 2:40 p.m. PRESENTATION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES (CONTINUED)

2:40 p.m. – 2:50 p.m. BREAK

2:50 p.m. – 4:10 p.m. PRESENTATION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES (CONTINUED)

4:10 p.m. – 4:20 p.m. BREAK

4:20 p.m. – 5:40 p.m. PRESENTATION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES (CONTINUED)

41. At 5:40 p.m., the factual presentation of individual competition entries and the jury's discussion on them was completed.

5:40 p.m. – 6:15 p.m. SCHEDULE, PLAN FOR THE NEXT DAY OF THE EVALUATION MEETING

42. Subsequently, the jury discussed the programme of the evaluation meeting for the second day, 17 March 2021, and agreed to continue the evaluation meeting on 17 March 2021 from 9:00 a.m.
43. The first day of the jury's evaluation meeting was ended at 6:15 p.m.

DAY TWO – 17 March 2021

44. The following members of the jury attended the evaluation meeting on 17 March 2021:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
REGULAR MEMBERS	REGULAR MEMBERS
1. Bc. Jiří Svoboda, MBA – absent	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer
3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
ALTERNATES:	ALTERNATES:
1. Ing. Petr Hofhanzl (Správa železnic)	1. Ing. arch. Jan Kasl
2. Ing. Jakub Bazgier (Správa železnic)	2. Pavla Pannová
3. Ing. Pavla Urbánková (Správa železnic)	
4. Ing. Jakub Veselý (Správa železnic) – absent	
4. Ing. Petr Vaníček (Správa železnic)	
5. Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý	
6. JUDr. Tomáš Homola	

45. The following individuals also took part in the jury's evaluation meeting on 17 March 2021:

Representative of the Competition organiser:	Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková
Competition Secretary:	Ing. arch. Miroslav Vodák

Competition Entries Reviewer:	Ing. arch. Tomáš Zdvihal
Invited Expert:	Ing. Martin Hvězda
Invited Expert:	Ing. Lukáš Tittl

9:00 a.m. – 9:10 a.m. INTRODUCTION

46. On 17 March 2021 at 9:00 a.m., the evaluation meeting of the Competition jury was started by the representative of the Competition organiser, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková.
47. At the beginning, individual members of the jury, representatives of the subsidiary bodies of the Competition jury and invited experts were welcomed.
48. Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková recapitulated the course of the first day of the evaluation meeting and, at the same time, presented the planned schedule of the second day of the evaluation meeting of the jury.

9:10 a.m. – 09:30 a.m. PRESENTATION OF THE DESIGN OF THE SMÍCHOV TERMINAL

49. From 9:10 a.m. to 9:30 a.m., Ing. Tittl and Ing. arch. Wertig presented the current design of the Smíchov Terminal.

9:30 a.m. – 12:00 noon VOTING OF THE JURY (SHORTLIST – ADVANCE TO THE NEXT ROUND OF EVALUATION)

50. From 9:40 a.m., following i) individual studying of the competition entries, ii) presentation of the competition entries on the first day of the jury evaluation meeting, and iii) discussion of the jury conducted on the first day of the jury evaluation meeting when introducing the competition entries, the jury proceeded to vote, for every competition entry, about which competition entries will advance to the next round of the evaluation and will be subject to further detailed discussion of the Competition jury. The jury based its vote on the extent to which the individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria of paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms.

Voting jurors:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Ing. Petr Hofhanzl (Správa železnic)	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer
3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

51. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: Each voting member of the jury shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury decides by a majority of votes; unless another voting procedure is specified in the protocol. The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

IN FAVOUR: 7
AGAINST: 0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

52. **9:43 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 1**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 1 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 4
AGAINST: 3
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 1 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

53. **09:45 a.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 2.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 2 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 2
AGAINST: 5
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 2 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

54. **9:50 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 3.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 3 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7
AGAINST: 0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 3 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

55. **10:03 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 4.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 4 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 1

AGAINST: 6

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 4 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

56. **10:05 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 5.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 5 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 5 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

57. **10:08 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 6.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 6 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 1

AGAINST: 6

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 6 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

58. **10:10 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 7.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 7 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 7 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

59. **10:12 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 8.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 8 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the*

competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

IN FAVOUR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 8 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

60. **10:14 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 9.**

Question from Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 9 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

IN FAVOUR: 7
AGAINST: 0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 9 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

61. **10:16 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 10.**

Question from Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

IN FAVOUR: 6
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

62. **10:19 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 11.**

Question from Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 11 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

IN FAVOUR: 6
AGAINST: 1
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 11 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

63. **10:24 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 12.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 12 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 12 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

64. **10:27 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 13.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 13 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 13 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

65. **10:31 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 14.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 14 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 3

AGAINST: 4

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 14 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

66. **10:34 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 15.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 15 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where*

the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

IN FAVOUR: 5
AGAINST: 2
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 15 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

67. **10:40 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 16.**

Question from Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 16 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

IN FAVOUR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 16 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

68. **10:47 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 17.**

Question from Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 17 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

IN FAVOUR: 2
AGAINST: 5
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 17 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

69. **10:53 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 18.**

Question from Kulhánková: "Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 18 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"

IN FAVOUR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 18 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

70. **10:55 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 19.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 19 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 19 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

71. **11:00 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 20.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 20 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 6

AGAINST: 1

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 20 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

72. **11:07 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 21.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 21 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 4

AGAINST: 3

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 21 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

73. **11:17 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 22.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 22 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 5
AGAINST: 2
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 22 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

74. **11:19 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 23.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 23 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 23 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

75. **11:20 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 24.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 24 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 24 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

76. **11:23 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 25.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 25 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 6
AGAINST: 1

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 25 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

77. **11:26 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 26.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 26 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 26 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

78. **11:27 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 27.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 27 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 1

AGAINST: 6

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 27 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

79. **11:30 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 28.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 28 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 28 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

80. **11:31 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 29.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 29 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7
AGAINST: 0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 29 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

81. **11:37 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 30.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 30 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 30 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

82. **11:40 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 31.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 31 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 31 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

83. **11:44 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 32.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 32 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7
AGAINST: 0
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 32 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

84. **11:46 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 33.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 33 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 1
AGAINST: 6
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 33 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

85. **11:50 a.m. Voting on Competition Entry No. 34.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 34 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 34 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

86. Following the voting result, a list of competition entries which advance to the next round of the evaluation was subsequently summarised, namely:

Competition Entry No. 1
Competition Entry No. 3
Competition Entry No. 9
Competition Entry No. 10
Competition Entry No. 11
Competition Entry No. 13
Competition Entry No. 15
Competition Entry No. 19
Competition Entry No. 20
Competition Entry No. 21
Competition Entry No. 22
Competition Entry No. 25
Competition Entry No. 29
Competition Entry No. 32

87. After the voting, Mgr. Kulhánková asked if any of the members of the jury had any proposal for revocation. No proposal for revocation was made.
88. The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

12:00 noon – 12:45 p.m. BREAK

12:45 p.m. – 5:15 p.m. DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE JURY

89. After the break from 12:45 p.m. to 5:15 p.m., the jury had a detailed discussion about the competition entries, which advanced to this part of the evaluation of the competition entries (point 26 of the Protocol), under ongoing presence and with comments of invited experts.

5:15 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. VOTING OF THE JURY (SHORTLIST – ADVANCE TO THE NEXT ROUND OF EVALUATION)

90. After the end of the joint discussion on individual competition entries, the jury proceeded, following the detailed discussion conducted by the jurors on the individual competition entries pursuant to point 86 of the Protocol, to vote on which competition entries from the competition entries under point 86 of the Protocol will advance to the next round of the evaluation and will be subject to another detailed discussion of the Competition jury. The jury based its vote on the extent to which the individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria of paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms.

91. Voting jurors:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Ing. Petr Hofhanzl (Správa železnic)	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer
3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

92. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: Each voting member of the jury shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury decides by a majority of votes; unless another voting procedure is specified in the protocol. The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

IN FAVOUR: 7
 AGAINST: 0
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

93. **5:27 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 1**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 1 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0
 AGAINST: 7
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 1 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

94. **5:28 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 3.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 3 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 2

AGAINST: 5

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 3 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

95. **5:29 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 9.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 9 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 9 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

96. **5:30 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 10.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 6

AGAINST: 1

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

97. **5:31 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 11.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 11 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 6

AGAINST: 1

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 11 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

98. **5:32 p.m.:** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 13.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 13 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 3

AGAINST: 4

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 13 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

99. **5:33 p.m.:** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 15.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 15 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 1

AGAINST: 6

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 15 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

100. **5:34 p.m.:** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 19.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 19 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 19 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

101. **5:35 p.m.:** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 20.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 20 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 6

AGAINST: 1

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 20 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

102. **5:36 p.m.:** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 21.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 21 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 1

AGAINST: 6

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 21 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

103. **5:37 p.m.:** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 22.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 22 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 4

AGAINST: 3

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 22 advances to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

104. **5:38 p.m.:** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 25.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 25 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 1

AGAINST: 6

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 25 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

105. **5:39 p.m.** **Voting on Competition Entry No. 29.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 29 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

FOR: 0
AGAINST: 7
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 29 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

106. **5:40 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 32.**

Question from Kulhánková: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 32 advancing to the next round of competition entries evaluation, i.e. to the next detailed debate, where the competition entry will be repeatedly evaluated in terms of the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions?"*

IN FAVOUR: 3
AGAINST: 4
ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 32 does not advance to the next round of competition entries evaluation.**

107. Following the voting result, a list of competition entries which advance to the next round of the evaluation was subsequently summarised, namely:

Competition Entry No. 10
Competition Entry No. 11
Competition Entry No. 19
Competition Entry No. 20
Competition Entry No. 22

108. After the voting, Mgr. Kulhánková asked if any of the members of the jury had any proposal for revocation. No proposal for revocation was made.

109. The chairman of the jury, with his consent, confirmed the procedural correctness of the performed voting.

5:40 p.m. – 6:15 p.m. SCHEDULE, PLAN FOR THE NEXT DAY OF THE EVALUATION MEETING

110. Subsequently, the jury discussed the programme of the evaluation meeting for the third day, 18 March 2021, and agreed to continue the evaluation meeting on 18 March 2021 from 9:00 a.m.

111. The first day of the jury's evaluation meeting was ended at 6:15 p.m.

DAY THREE – 18 March 2021

112. The following members of the jury attended the evaluation meeting on 18 March 2021:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
REGULAR MEMBERS	REGULAR MEMBERS
1. Bc. Jiří Svoboda, MBA – present from 1:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer
3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
ALTERNATES:	ALTERNATES:
1. Ing. Petr Hofhanzl (Správa železnic)	1. Ing. arch. Jan Kasl
2. Ing. Jakub Bazgier (Správa železnic)	2. Pavla Pannová
3. Ing. Pavla Urbánková (Správa železnic)	
4. Ing. Jakub Veselý (Správa železnic) – absent	
4. Ing. Petr Vaníček (Správa železnic)	
5. Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý	
6. JUDr. Tomáš Homola	

113. The following individuals also took part in the jury's evaluation meeting on 18 March 2021:

Representative of the Competition organiser:	Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková
--	------------------------

Competition Secretary:	Ing. arch. Miroslav Vodák
Competition Entries Reviewer:	Ing. arch. Tomáš Zdvihal
Invited Expert:	Ing. Martin Hvězda
Invited Expert:	Ing. Lukáš Tittl

9:00 a.m. – 9:10 a.m. INTRODUCTION

114. On 18 March 2021 at 9:00 a.m., the evaluation meeting of the Competition jury was started by the representative of the Competition organiser, Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková.
115. At the beginning, individual members of the jury, representatives of the subsidiary bodies of the Competition jury and invited experts were welcomed.
116. Mgr. Kamila Kulhánková recapitulated the course of the second day of the evaluation meeting and, at the same time, presented the planned schedule of the third day of the evaluation meeting of the jury.

9:10 a.m. – 9:20 a.m.: VIDEO PROJECTION OF SPRÁVA ŽELEZNIC

117. From 9:10 a.m. to 9:20 a.m., Správa železnic presented to the jurors a video projection on the current state of the buildings in which Správa železnic is located and on the working conditions of Správa železnic's employees.

9:20 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.: DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE JURY

118. From 9:20 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., the jury had a detailed discussion about the competition entries, which advanced to this part of the evaluation of the competition entries (point 107 of the Protocol), under ongoing presence and with comments of invited experts.

12:30 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. BREAK

1:00 p.m. – 1:50 p.m. DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE JURY

119. From 1:00 p.m. to 1:50 p.m., the jury continued the detailed discussion about the competition entries, which advanced to this part of the evaluation of the competition entries (point 107 of the Protocol), under ongoing presence and with comments of invited experts.

1:50 p.m. – 1:55 p.m. VOTING OF THE JURY (FOR SELECTION OF AWARDED COMPETITION ENTRIES)

120. After the end of the joint detailed discussion of the jury about individual competition entries pursuant to point 107 of the Protocol, the jury proceeded to vote on which competition entries pursuant to point 107 of the Protocol should be awarded competition prizes within the Competition, pursuant to paragraph 9.2 of the Competition Terms and Conditions; the jury will vote based on the extent to which individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, namely

following the findings of the jury identified in the detailed discussion about individual competition entries.

121. Voting jurors:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Bc. Jiří Svoboda, MBA (Správa železnic)	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Pavla Pannová
3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

122. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: Each voting member of the jury shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury decides by a majority of votes; unless another voting procedure is specified in the protocol. The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

123. **1:50 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 10.**

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 being awarded the Competition prize?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 shall be awarded the Competition prize.**

124. **1:51 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 11.**

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 11 being awarded the Competition prize?"*

IN FAVOUR: 2

AGAINST: 5

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 11 shall not be awarded the Competition prize.**

125. **1:52 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 19.**

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 19 being awarded the Competition prize?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 19 shall be awarded the Competition prize.**

126. **1:53 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 20.**

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 20 being awarded the Competition prize?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 20 shall be awarded the Competition prize.**

127. **1:55 p.m.: Voting on Competition Entry No. 22.**

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 22 being awarded the Competition prize?"*

IN FAVOUR: 0

AGAINST: 7

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 22 shall not be awarded the Competition prize.**

128. After the voting, Mgr. Kulhánková asked if any of the members of the jury had any proposal for revocation. No proposal for revocation was made.

129. Following the vote, Mgr. Kulhánková summarised that the jury decided by voting (carried out on the basis of the evaluation, to what extent individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, namely following the findings of the jury identified within the individual studying of the competition entries before the evaluation meeting, as well as within the joint discussion about individual competition entries conducted during the evaluation meeting) that the following competition entries will be awarded within the Competition:

Competition Entry No. 10
Competition Entry No. 19
Competition Entry No. 20

1:55 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. VOTING OF THE JURY (ABOUT AWARDS SPECIFIC TO COMPETITION ENTRIES):

130. The jury subsequently proceeded to vote on the awards specific to the competition entries pursuant to point 129 of the Protocol with the competition prizes pursuant to paragraph 9.2 of the Competition Terms and Conditions; the jury will vote based on the extent to which the individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, namely following the findings of the jury identified in the detailed discussion about individual competition entries.

131. Voting jurors:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Bc. Jiří Svoboda, MBA (Správa železnic)	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík
2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Pavla Pannová
3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

132. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: Each voting member of the jury shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury decides by a majority of votes; unless another voting procedure is specified in the protocol. The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

IN FAVOUR: 7
 AGAINST: 0
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

133. **1:55 p.m.:** Voting about ranking on the 1st awarded place

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 19 being awarded the 1st prize in the Competition?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7
 AGAINST: 0
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 19 shall be awarded the 1st competition prize.**

134. **1:56 p.m.:** Voting about ranking on the 2nd awarded place

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 10 being awarded the 2nd prize in the Competition?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7
 AGAINST: 0
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 10 shall be awarded the 2nd competition prize.**

135. **1:58 p.m.:** Voting about ranking on the 3rd awarded place

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of Competition Entry No. 20 being awarded the 3rd prize in the Competition?"*

IN FAVOUR: 7

AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Competition Entry No. 20 shall be awarded the 3rd competition prize.**

136. Following the vote, Mgr. Kulhánková summarised that the jury decided by voting (carried out on the basis of the evaluation, to what extent individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 6.1.1. of the Specified Competition Terms and Conditions, namely following the findings of the jury identified within the individual studying of the competition entries before the evaluation meeting, as well as within the joint discussion about individual competition entries) that the ranking of the competition entries is as follows:

Competition Entry No. 19	1st prize
Competition Entry No. 10	2nd prize
Competition Entry No. 20	3rd prize

137. After the voting, Mgr. Kulhánková asked if any of the members of the jury had any proposal for revocation. No proposal for revocation was made.
138. At the same time, Mgr. Kulhánková summarised that under the conditions set out in Section 10 (8) and Section 12 (2) of the CCA Competition Rules, the jury may decide, in exceptional cases, that some of the listed prizes and the amounts assigned to them will not be distributed or will be distributed in a different way. In special cases, the jury may decide to distribute the total amount into individual prizes differently. The jury must give detailed reasons for its decision in the minutes of the Competition, together with a record of the voting of the full members of the jury. In this regard, Mgr. Kulhánková asked the jury whether any of the jurors raises a proposal to proceed according to Section 10 (8) and Section 12 (2) of the CCA Competition Rules, with the proviso that if no such proposal is raised, then the competition prizes will be distributed as stated in paragraph 9.2. of the Competition Terms and Conditions (see also point 24 of the Protocol). None of the jurors raised the above-mentioned proposal to proceed pursuant to Section 10 (8) and Section 12 (2) of the CCA Competition Rules.

2:00 p.m. – 2:11 p.m. VOTING OF THE JURY (FOR COMPETITION AWARDS)

139. The jury subsequently proceeded to vote on which competition entries should be awarded with the reward pursuant to paragraph 9.4 of the Competition Terms and Conditions.
140. Voting jurors:

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY
1. Bc. Jiří Svoboda, MBA (Správa železnic)	1. Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík

2. Ing. Radim Anton (Správa železnic)	2. Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer
3. Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	3. Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško
	4. David Hlouch

141. The following procedure was proposed for the vote: Each voting member of the jury shall have one vote. The jury has a quorum. The jury decides by a majority of votes; unless another voting procedure is specified in the protocol. The procedure described above was approved by the jury as follows:

IN FAVOUR: 7
 AGAINST: 0
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

142. For the vote on the reward, a proposal was made that the total amount for the reward be divided in a ratio of 80:20.

2:03 p.m.: Vote on the proposal

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who's in favour of the total amount of the reward being divided in a ratio of 80:20?"*

IN FAVOUR: 2
 AGAINST: 5
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **The proposal was not accepted.**

143. For the vote on the reward, a proposal was made that the total amount for the reward be divided in a ratio of 80:20.

2:05 p.m.: Vote on the proposal

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who's in favour of the total amount of the reward being divided in a ratio of 50:50?"*

IN FAVOUR: 5
 AGAINST: 2
 ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **The proposal was accepted.**

144. For the vote on the reward, a proposal was raised to reward Competition Entry No. 11 with the amount of CZK 500,000.

2:09 p.m.: Vote on the proposal

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of the Competition Entry No. 11 being rewarded with the amount of CZK 500,000?"*

IN FAVOUR: 6
 AGAINST: 0

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 1

Voting result: **Entry No. 11 shall be rewarded with the amount of CZK 500,000.**

145. For the vote on the reward, a proposal was made to reward Competition Entry No. 22 with the amount of CZK 500,000.

2:11 p.m.: Vote on the proposal

Question of Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík: *"Who is in favour of the Competition Entry No. 22 being rewarded with the amount of CZK 500,000?"*

IN FAVOUR: 5

AGAINST: 2

ABSTAINED FROM VOTING: 0

Voting result: **Entry No. 22 shall be rewarded with the amount of CZK 500,000.**

2:11 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. FORMULATION OF THE VERBAL EVALUATION AND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS, AUTHOR DOCUMENT

146. The jury jointly formulated a verbal evaluation of the competition entries evaluated in the 2nd stage of the Competition and recommendations for the awarded competition entries, as set out below.

RECORD OF THE VERBAL EVALUATION OF THE COMPETITION ENTRIES

147. **The jury jointly formulated a verbal evaluation of the individual competition entries according to the extent to which the individual competition entries met the evaluation criteria pursuant to paragraph 8.1. of the Competition Terms and Conditions, in connection with the findings of the jury identified within the individual study of the competition entries and during the joint discussion held by the jurors on the individual competition entries.**

	OVERALL QUALITY OF THE URBAN, ARCHITECTURAL, CONSTRUCTION, TRANSPORT AND LANDSCAPE DESIGN OF THE COMPETITION ENTRY	ECONOMIC ADEQUACY OF THE CONSTRUCTION ENTRY FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF INVESTMENT PROPOSALS
Competition Entry No. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable use of a double facade with opening windows and elegant design of details - geometry of the corrugated facade affects the less efficient layout design and layout variability - corrugated street facade is not suitable in the given place from the urbanistic point of view of strengthening of the street line - overall design of the masses of all three buildings is not convincing from the urbanistic point of view - schematic interior design without significant identification elements - illegibility of the overall architectural expression for building the identity of the Contracting Authority - lack of distinctiveness of the main entrances to the building and their location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mass and material inspiration by railway motifs - railway viaduct, company logo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – many different inconsistent masses and elements in the overall design of all buildings – confusing layout especially at the level of lower floors – unsuitable extension of the ramp area into the building space – receding platforms – unsuitable location of the registry and retail areas in building A – good layout in building B, large depth of the tract in building C – statically unconvincing structural design of vaults 	<p>be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.</p>
Competition Entry No. 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – very civil entry with a convincing and confident expression – contrasting, memorable and, at the same time, dynamic look – convenient placement of the ramp outside the building – good layouts in building C with daylight, less suitable location of the main entrance – layouts in buildings A and B are less transparent and too schematic – suitable use of a double facade with opening windows and repeated design of details – schematism of the western facade of building C at the cores and ramp 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – too large volume of buildings with large inner atria – unconvincing intertwining of structural and architectural design of facades – too big a depth of layout of buildings B and C without natural lighting – convenient location of main entrances, entrances and retail units – too massive connection between buildings B and C 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - overall too dominant, inconsistent and compositionally heavy mass - more economically demanding and less efficient design 	
Competition Entry No. 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the declared identity of the buildings is not architecturally justified in the given place - more demanding structural design allows for versatility of layout - exterior wooden elements of the facade are problematic from the perspective of maintenance of both surfaces and details - the form of roofing is very schematic and structurally inefficient - unsuitable location of the workplaces near inner atriums - convincing and suitable design of the ramp and ground floor of building C towards the platform - space reserve in the place of building A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - convincing division into a continuous plinth and levitating structures - the chosen mass and structural design have a negative impact on the layout - unconvincing material and urban design between buildings A and B - the vertical garden is not a justified design in the given place - the interior design uses too formal graphic motifs - inefficient location and orientation of solar panels - suitable location of kindergarten and fitness in building A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

<p>Competition Entry No. 7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very memorable architectural design with a strong identity - unsuitable structural design with exposed wooden supporting structure - unsuitable design of a double facade cladding from the perspective of the internal environment - the selected arch shape significantly reduces the usable area - large proportion of roads and corridors in the layouts - the placement of vertical cores into gable walls does not utilise the potential of these facades - economically, technically and operationally demanding design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>Competition Entry No. 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unconvincing concept based on Czech traditional forms - architectural design and layout do not correspond to the assignment of the competition - the building hardly responds to the specificity of the given place - the proposed trail is a too formal design - the design of facade panels is not suitable for administrative operations - the tip of building A is a spatially and structurally inefficient design - the material and interior design does not correspond to the identity of the Contracting Authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>Competition Entry No. 9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - compact volume of one building C, with a reserve in place of buildings A and B - cost-effective, efficient and effective design yet colliding with the limits of the building block - a pair of height-shifted office tracts with an inner atrium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unsuitable location of some of the administrative workplaces inside the layout - unconvincing design of gable walls, north and south facades - clean and refined interior design - unsuitable and schematic design of public spaces and ground floor of the building - 	
Competition Entry No. 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very convincing urban and mass design with a solid street front - adequate height, yet with dominant accents - solidity of architectural expression with reference to the classical order - high quality of layout and offices around the perimeter of the floor plan - great possibility of universal and variable design of the interior layout - a higher proportion of relatively unused area inside the tract, including roads - the design of the northern piazza with the main entrance to the building is a significant urban feat - it shows the potential of the viaduct and of the public spaces in the southern part - the design of the facade of building A at the ramp and the location of the pavement along the platform is questionable - the ratio of volumes to areas is effective and there is a space reserve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - convincing and strong urban gesture with a dominant tower - the design of the mass exceeds the recommended regulation, but can be defended in the overall context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - facade design with traditional and industrial compositional elements - quality and timeless material design with undemanding details - volume-wise, area-wise, structurally and economically efficient design - generous entrance foyer and inner atrium illuminating the inner tracts - very sophisticated and variable layout - very high-quality design of public spaces in connection with the station and the terminal - large reserve for the next stages of the project in the place of buildings A and B 	
Competition Entry No. 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - monumental scale of buildings that is unsuitable for the urban situation at hand - the architectural and material rendering is too brutalist - the interior design does not correspond to the architectural and structural design - deep tracts of offices of buildings B and C with lack of daylight - this is a too big gesture for the identity of the Contracting Authority - roof terraces are perceived positively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - strong concept based on the structural design of steel frames - a relatively clear and variable layout within the limits of construction - unsuitable and effectively chosen width of buildings and depth of tracts - too massive bridging - too monotonous and modular interior design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - too monotonous design of the western facade to the track - problematic structural and thermal-technical design of the facade details 	
Competition Entry No. 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - overall cultivated and calm raster of the facade with a suitably chosen and elegant division - the mass of the street front is disturbed by too many smaller small-scale leaps - the connective diagonal and the logo motif used on the facade and the hub is formal in many places - many workplaces in the middle tract do not have sufficient daylight - suitably designed private park space between the building and the track - suitably designed location of the ramp outside building C - unsuitable design and location of the ramps in the underground parking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very dynamic and effective motif for facade design - the overall scale and architectural expression of the building is not suitable for the planned city boulevard - the use of galvanised steel sheet seems to be problematic for exterior elements - cantilevering of terraces is structurally demanding and inefficient in many places - in terms of layout, dispositionally variable and effective solution with greater depth of tract means limiting the intensity of natural lighting in the central parts of the disposition - suitable location of the ramp for BUS outside the building, unsuitable location of most retail in building B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interesting motif for public space with a view at the top of building A 	
Competition Entry No. 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the chosen architectural and urbanistic design does not correspond to the character of the place or the required function - unsuitably chosen structural design of the building with a number of demanding details - exterior wooden elements and glazing of the facade require demanding maintenance - the design of the ground floor does not correspond to the urban character of the planned street - vertical cores are too dominant overall - the layout has little variability and is generally confusing - the location (integration) of the ramp within the building is solved unconvincingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
Competition Entry No. 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - linear composition scheme of a pair of buildings connected by a footbridge (two-storey neck) - cultivated facade cladding with reference to the identity of the Contracting Authority - simple structural design with less variability of internal layouts - undersized facilities on individual floors with a small width of the middle tract - suitably located ramp outside the building, unsuitable location of the kindergarten - the interior design with expressive elements does not correspond to the identity of the Contracting Authority - the massive upper connection integrates the two masses into a too large monolithic unit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

<p>Competition Entry No. 18</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the selected module does not form a sufficiently strong composition of the facades when used repeatedly - schematic and naive structural design of winter gardens, it is a key design element - very refined and clean interior design of the entrance lobby - the layout of the offices does not allow sufficient daylight - building B inappropriately interferes with the proposed view in the urban grid - unsuitable location of the ramp in the parking lot near the kindergarten - floor plans of the underground floors are missing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>Competition Entry No. 19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - solid and memorable building emphasising the identity of the Contracting Authority - from the point of view of urbanistic and mass design, well-achieved three buildings respecting the proposed regulation - contemporary architectural expression with reference to the industrial poetics of railway constructions - the depth of the tracts allows for good lighting of workplaces - the dimension and construction of the connecting footbridge need to be verified in the next stage - timeless design of the interior of the entrance lobby - simple and effective structural and material design - suitable placement of photovoltaic panels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>COMPETITION ENTRY NO. 20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - from the point of view of urbanistic and mass design, well-achieved formation of mass into smaller structures – towers - very civil expression that is both memorable and unique 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - well-solved shading of the building by a continuous cantilever and an overhanging blind - very good vertical connection of floors, worse horizontal permeability - well designed outdoor atriums and roof gardens - simple and effective structural and material design - quality layout with great variability - the design of the pavement around the rail-yard is questionable 	
Competition Entry No. 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - distinctive and confident urban and mass design - the supporting structure of the skeleton and its material design is successfully inspired by the railway - the overhanging facade is a structurally and investment-wise more demanding design - the design of the facades is too conservative - postmodern, and lacks greater dynamism - large part of workplaces do not have sufficient daylight - southern tip with school garden platform and archive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
COMPETITION ENTRY NO. 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - maximum utilisation of the possible enclosed volume - very dynamic design with an effective element of the railway - identification of the Contracting Authority - adheres to building regulations, but unnecessarily complicated in the street front - layout in places of curved facades to be completed - most workplaces with sufficient daylight - generous design of roof terraces with extensive roof photovoltaic panels built into the facade cladding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
COMPETITION ENTRY NO. 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unconvincing urban and mass design, especially for the construction line of building B - unsuitable design of internal layout with one-sided orientation of workplaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the design of the facade cladding lacks the motif of the Contracting Authority's identity - unconvincing design of the ground floor in Nádražní street and the southern tip of the solved area - unsuitable and economically demanding use of a noise-proof glass wall, not city-forming - less suitable location of ramps in the underground car park 	
COMPETITION NO. 24	ENTRY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in this situation a too robust design of the masses of the buildings and of the roof structure - division of buildings without a link to the building programme with insufficient horizontal interconnection - very schematic layout of office spaces - structurally complicated design of the exterior load-bearing structure with too many details - interesting motif of the chart, but too formal, without adequate urban detail - quality visual design of the competition entry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
COMPETITION NO. 25	ENTRY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - spatially efficient single-mass design – one institution with one entry - the mass of the house reaches the maximum limits of utilisation of the building land - up to 8 above-ground floors and 4 underground floors - solid expression with reference to the traditional perception of a major institution - too high density of office workplaces, it is rather an open space - lack of daylight in the internal tracts - formal termination of the columns at the cantilevered part and formal design of the ground floor of the building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

COMPETITION NO. 26	ENTRY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unsuitable architectural and urban design in the given place - overexposed structural and other elements on the facade - schematic layout without greater possibility of variability - improperly designed entrance to the underground car park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
COMPETITION NO. 27	ENTRY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unsuitable architectural expression of the house reminds of another typology – gallery, library - too much emphasis on the "spine wall", practically does not solve street facades - one-sided orientation of design unsuitable in terms of layout, does not allow for lighting of workplaces - plinth and ground floor to Nádražní street do not create a pleasant street space - the material design of both types of tiling is not suitable and sufficiently substantiated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
COMPETITION NO. 28	ENTRY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very complicated and inefficient design of load-bearing structures - large area of facades is uneconomical both in terms of construction and operation - the architectural design with its character does not fit into urban environment - green roofs of the garden are located under the roof of other buildings - the designed area accessible to the public does not have sufficient justification in the given place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
COMPETITION NO. 29	ENTRY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - interesting design from the urbanistic point of view, with the opening of masses responding to the context of the Smíchov grid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - quality work with scale and composition of facades, very contemporary and elegant design - social and informal spaces of the inner atriums and the connecting bridge are far too large - great emphasis on individual public spaces between the buildings - structurally more demanding connecting bridge with unconvincing functionality - declared modularity and flexibility of the construction and layout-- greater for building C than for building B - the design and use of the platform space does not correspond to the expected reality 	<p>be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.</p>
COMPETITION NO. 30	ENTRY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - too large volume of designed buildings with unsuitable urban design of the construction line - unsuitable design of the ground floor of the buildings and of the adjoining street space - unsuitable material design of facades and their division - complicated structural design with limited possibility of internal variability - very schematic and unconvincing design of the construction's interior 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
COMPETITION NO. 31	ENTRY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inadequate urban and architectural design in the given place, shape reminiscence of wagons and wheels - structurally and investment-wise demanding design of no benefits - too formal layout in circular floor plans is not operationally justified - relatively simple but large area of facades and ceilings - the orientation of parts of the facades with view is not justifiable or logical 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.

<p>COMPETITION ENTRY NO. 32</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - relatively successful architectural design with receding masses, exaggerated division of facades - structurally more demanding design with a number of cantilevers very elegant design of the facade cladding - only large format fixed glazing with ventilation - unsuitable one-sided layout and placement of cores in receding floors - convenient placement of the ramp outside building C - the interior design lags behind the external architectural quality of the building - facade lamellas have more of an aesthetic function - unconvincing southern ending with park area in A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>COMPETITION ENTRY NO. 33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the architectural and material design of the facades refers to the inspiration of railways, horizontal rails and vertical slats, sleepers, shading from the south, views to the north - The location of the DG section on the south side of building C is questionable - inappropriate solution of the ground floor of objects A and C in the form of a plinth - undersized dimensions of cores and backgrounds on floors - very elegant interior design - well-completed solution of aspects of sustainable design with the ambition of LEED, BREEAM certificates - quality visual processing of the competition entry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals.
<p>COMPETITION ENTRY NO. 34</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the architectural and material design of the facades significantly refers to the inspiration by the railway at the cost of suppressing the urban character of the public space - Nádražní street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the information provided by the participant, the construction design appears to be economically reasonable from the perspective of the investment proposals, at the upper limit of acceptability

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- in a given place, the mass and scale of the objects act peripherally, the goal is exclusion, hiding the house behind the lace of the green rail- the expected high operating costs and sustainability of the vegetation façade, which are an essential element of the design	
--	---	--

148. The jury then formulated the jury's recommendations for the Contracting Authority for the awarded competition entries, as follows:

	SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JURY
Competition Entry No. 19	<p>The jury recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in cooperation with the Contracting Authority to further specify the possible use of building "A"
Competition Entry No. 10	<p>The jury recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in cooperation with the Contracting Authority to further specify the solution of the northern piazza and the platform area at building C
Competition Entry No. 20	<p>The jury recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in cooperation with the Contracting Authority to strengthen the identity of the building for the purposes of the future headquarters of Správa železnic

149. Mgr. Kulhánková subsequently asked the jurors, whether any of the voting members of the jury was interested in exercising the right to revoke or to record any different opinion in the Protocol. None of the voting members of the jury exercised this right.

INFORMATION TO THE JURY ABOUT THE COMPETITION PARTICIPANTS

150. In connection with the consent of the chairman of the jury, Mgr. Kulhánková subsequently proceeded to open the author document and acquainted the jury with the identification data of the individual participants in the Competition. The record of identification data of the Competition participants is as follows:

Competition entry accepted under the serial number (paper submission):	Competition entry accepted under the serial number (electronic submission):	New number of the competition entry after opening the envelopes with the graphic part of the competition entries: THE COMPETITIONS ENTRIES WERE EVALUATED UNDER THESE COMPETITION NUMBERS	Participant	Author
Competition entry No. 33	Competition entry No. 24	Competition entry No. 1	Henke Schreieck Architekten ZT GmbH Neubaugasse 2/5, 1070 Wien, Austria ID No.: FN332898 g/ UID: ATU65379002	Mag. arch. Dieter Henke
Competition entry No. 18	Competition entry No. 12	Competition entry No. 2	SCHINDLER SEKO ARCHITEKTI s.r.o. Wuchterlova 5, 160 00 Praha 6 IČO: 241 63 716	Jan Schindler-Wisten Ludvík Seko

Competition entry No. 35	Competition entry No. 33	Competition entry No. 3	Casua, spol. s r.o. Křižíkova 682/34a, 186 00 Praha 8 ID No.: 448 46 908	Ing. Oleg Haman
Competition entry No. 20	Competition entry No. 28	Competition entry No. 4	JAKUB CIGLER ARCHITEKTI, a.s. Nad Ostrovem 1119/7, 147 00 Praha 4 ID No.: 264 89 431	Doc. Ing. arch. Jakub Cigler
Competition entry No. 11	Competition entry No. 9	Competition entry No. 5	A8000 s.r.o. Radniční 136/7, 370 01 České Budějovice ID No.: 466 80 543	Ing. Martin Krupauer Ing. arch. Pavel Kvintus Ing. arch. Petr Jakšík
Competition entry No. 9	Competition entry No. 18	Competition entry No. 6	CMC architects, a.s. a ATELIER SMITKA s.r.o. Jankovcova 1037/49, 170 00 Praha 7 Komornická 12, 160 00 Praha 6	Dipl. arch. David Richard Chisholm Ing. arch. Daniel Smitka Ph.D.
Competition entry No. 2	Competition entry No. 4	Competition entry No. 7	Donghua Chen Studio Hei He Zi, No. 53-202, Xin Jiao Zhong Road no. 88, Haizhu District, Guangzhou, 510300, China ID No.: 91440101MA5AKMTK2N	Donghua Chen
Competition entry No. 1	Competition entry No. 13	Competition entry No. 8	MPN + PARTNERS Level 19, Ladeco Building, 266 Doi Can, Lieu Giaia, Ba Dinh, Hanoi, Vietnam ID No.: 0105929582	Minh Phuc Nguyen
Competition entry No. 19	Competition entry No. 25	Competition entry No. 9	A.D.N.S. architekti s.r.o. Na Příkopě 853/12, 110 00 Praha 1 ID No.: 272 51 128	Ak. arch. Martin Němec Ing. Petr Dvořák

Competition entry No. 21	Competition entry No. 15	Competition entry No. 10 2. prize/ place	Atelier M1 architekti, s.r.o. Markétská 1/28, 169 01 Praha 6 ID No.: 270 74 153	Mgr. akad. arch. Pavel Joba Ing. arch. Jakub Havlas Ing. arch. Jan Hájek MgA. Vojtěch Šaroun
Competition entry No. 3	Competition entry No. 8	Competition entry No. 11 REWARD OF CZK 500,000	Pelčák a partner architekti, s.r.o. Dominikánské náměstí 656/2, Brno – město, 602 00 ID No.: 282 70 355	Prof. Ing. arch. Petr Pelčák
Competition entry No. 22	Competition entry No. 19	Competition entry No. 12	ZAHA HADID LIMITED 10 Bowling Green Lane, London EC1R, United Kingdom ID No.: 03749443	Charles Walker Jakub Klaška
Competition entry No. 7	Competition entry No. 17	Competition entry No. 13	Atelier bod architekti s.r.o. Osadní 799/26, Praha 7 ID No.: 045 98 261	Ing. arch. Vojtěch Sosna Ing. arch. Jakub Straka
Competition entry No. 29	Competition entry No. 29	Competition entry No. 14	consequence forma s.r.o. Nový Hrozenkov 760, 756 04 Nový Hrozenkov ID No.: 048 49 582	Ing. arch. Martin Sládek Ing. arch. MArch. Janica Šipulová Ing. arch. Jiří Lasovský Ing. arch. Marek Šinágl
Competition entry No. 28	Competition entry No. 20	Competition entry No. 15	Kuba & Pilař architekti s.r.o. Kopečná 58, 602 00 Brno ID No.: 277 38 027	Ladislav Kuba Tomáš Pilař Radomír Feňo
Competition entry No. 15	Competition entry No. 6	Competition entry No. 16	Atelier J-interval Room 1101-C03, No. 8 Jinsui Road, Tianhe District, Guangzhou, China ID No.: 91440101MA5CJUFK1X	Jing He

Competition entry No. 25	Competition entry No. 23	Competition entry No. 17	SIEBERT + TALAŠ, spol. s r.o. Bucharova 1314/8, 158 00 Praha ID No.: 069 43 187	Ing. arch. Matej Siebert, Ph.D Ing. arch. Roman Talaš Ing. arch. Tomáš Klásek Ing. arch. Ivan Kulifaj
Competition entry No. 5	Competition entry No. 7	Competition entry No. 18	Bogle Architects s.r.o./ Ian Bogle Revoluční 724/7, 110 00, Praha 1 ID No.: 248 18 321	Ian Bogle
Competition entry No. 8	Competition entry No. 31	Competition entry No. 19 1. prize/ place	William Matthews Associates 169 Long Lane, London SE1 4PN, United Kingdom ID No.: 8416578	William Matthews Associates: William Matthews (autor) David Walker (spoluautor)
Competition entry No. 24	Competition entry No. 21	Competition entry No. 20 3. prize/ place	PERSPEKTIV/GRIDO Belgická 130/32, 120 00 Praha 2 Vinohrady ID No.: 026 96 622	Ing. arch. Ján Antal Ing. arch. Martin Stára Ing. arch. Peter Sticzay-Gromski Ing. Michal Rulc Ing. arch. Sebastian Sticzay Ing. arch. Silvia Snopková MgA. Jakub Herza
Competition entry No. 4	Competition entry No. 3	Competition entry No. 21	A B.K.Š.P., spol. s r.o. Nobelova č. 34, 831 02 Bratislava, Slovenská republika ID No.: 453 18 131	Ing. arch. Pavol Paňák Ing. arch. Martin Kusý st. II. Ing. arch. Martin Kusý III. Ing. arch. Robert Bakyta
Competition entry No. 16	Competition entry No. 32	Competition entry No. 22 REWARD OF CZK 500,000	Ing. arch. Petr Šuma (sdružení Boele) Družstevní 1016, Třemošná, 330 11 ID No.: 9144030067480964XF	Ing. arch. Petr Šuma Ing. arch. Pavel Fajfr

Competition entry No. 27	Competition entry No. 27	Competition entry No. 23	Jaeger Kahlen Partners Architects Ltd. Shenzhen, China	Peter Jaeger Johanes Jaeger
Competition entry No. 6	Competition entry No. 10	Competition entry No. 24	TAKENAKA EUROPE GmbH – organizační složka Evropská 846/176a, 160 00 Praha 6 ID No.: 643 55 535	Etsuo Kurata Ing. arch. Peter Mulík Hiroki Haji Yuji Murashita Ing. arch. David Lukas Ing. arch. Marta Vincencová Ing. arch. Tomáš Jelínek Tomáš Palkovský Denisa Kupková Barbara Adamska Ing. arch. Eliška Křížová
Competition entry No.26	Competition entry No.26	Competition entry No.25	Marek Chalupa architekti s.r.o. U Pergamenky 1522/2, 170 00 Praha 7 – Holešovice ID No.: 098 49 866	Ing. arch. Marek Chalupa
Competition entry No.14	Competition entry No.1	Competition entry No.26	Eduardo Lopez Morales Jose Maria Fernandez Lanseros N 10, 3-B, Madrid, Spain ID No.: 18882 COAM	Eduardo Lopez Morales
Competition entry No.17	Competition entry No.16	Competition entry No.27	Stephenson STUDIO ltd 3 Riverside Mews, 4 Commercial Street, Manchester, M15 4RQ, United Kingdom ID No.: 8324071	Justin Rislej
Competition entry No.23	Competition entry No.14	Competition entry No.28	Studio Seilern Architects Limited / Christina Seilern 24 Scrubs Lane, NW10 6RA, London, United Kingdom	Christina Seilern

			ID No.: 07195180	
Competition entry No.30	Competition entry No.22	Competition entry No.29	CHYBIK + KRISTOF ASSOCIATED ARCHITECTS s.r.o. Dominikánské nám. 656/2, Brno – město, 602 00 ID No.: 038 87 707	Ing. arch. Ondřej Chybík Ing. arch. Michal Křištof
Competition entry No.10/13	Competition entry No. 5	Competition entry No. 30	Neslihan Gülhan/ NODE Architecture Engineering Construction Decoration Industry and Trade Limited Company Istanbul, Turkey ID No.: 2970712520491	Dogan Turkkan Hande Gul Turkkan Neslihan Gulhan
Competition entry No. 32	Competition entry No.2	Competition entry No.31	Arquitectos Ayala S.L.P. C/Boix y Morer 6, 2 Izq., 28003 Madrid, Spain ID No.: B 85410488	Gerardo Ayala Hernández Mateo Ayala Calvo Marcos Ayala Calvo
Competition entry No.34	Competition entry No.30	Competition entry No. 32	JIKA-CZ s.r.o Dlouhá 103/17, Hradec Králové 500 03 ID No.: 259 172 34	Libor Toman Jiří Slánský
Competition entry No.12	Competition entry No.11	Competition entry No.33	AFRY CZ s.r.o. Magistrů 1275/13, 140 00 Praha 4 - Michle ID No.: 453 06 605	Afry CZ, s.r.o. GOTTLIEB PALUDAN ARCHITECTS A/S: Tine Kjærulff Bay Jesper Gottlieb
Competition entry No.31	Competition entry No.34	Competition entry No.34	Ing. Arch. MgA. Petr Janda Na Švihance 1549/8, 120 00 Praha 2 - Vinohrady ID No.: 653 61 814	Ing. arch. MgA. Petr Janda

151. At the end of its meeting, the jury thanked the Contracting Authority for organising the Competition and expressed its appreciation for the fact that the Contracting Authority announced this Competition. At the same time, the jury expressed its conviction that the awarded competition entries reach high qualities, and the selected competition entry will, after its implementation, fulfil its main function properly – it will become dignified headquarters of Správa železnic, státní organizace, and at the same time urbanistically will help to properly complete to the wider surroundings.
152. At the end of the meeting, the representatives of the Contracting Authority thanked the members of the jury for their work, for cooperation throughout the entire Competition and for the overall approach of all jurors to the Competition and the Contracting Authority's intention.
153. The jury ended its evaluation meeting by a closing speech of the Chairman of the jury on 18 March 2021 at 3:30 p.m.

Annexes to the Protocol:

Annex No. 1 Statement of the jurors on participation in the online evaluation meeting

Annex No. 2 Reviewer's Report

DEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	
Bc. Jiří Svoboda, MBA	
Ing. Radim Anton	
Ing. arch. Jaroslav Wertig	
Ing. Petr Hofhanzl	
Ing. Jakub Bazgier	
Ing. Pavla Urbánková	
Ing. Jakub Veselý	Absent from the evaluation meeting
Ing. Petr Vaníček	
Ing. arch. Tomáš Veselý	
JUDr. Tomáš Homola	

INDEPENDENT PART OF THE JURY	
Doc. Ing. arch. Radek Kolařík	
Ing. arch. MgA. Michal Fišer	
Ing. arch. MgA. David Mateáško	
David Hlouch	
Ing. arch. Jan Kasl	
Pavla Pannová	